THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 442. (Vol. X.—7.) CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 13, 1896. { One Dollar per Year. Single Copies, 5 Cents.

EUROPEAN OPINIONS ON THE SECOND PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.

[The success of the projected Second Religious Parliament in Paris seems to be assured. Abbé Charbonnel has received a number of letters from leading men commenting upon his views set forth in an article published in the *Revue de Paris*. Among them there are only two that doubt the advisability of holding a Second Religious Parliament,—Mgr. Jauffret, Bishop of Bayonne, and Prof. Alfred Baudrillart. We offer our readers a translation of Abbé Charbonnel's letters as published in the *Revue Bleue* of Paris.]

LETTER FROM MGR. JAUFFRET.

[Bishop of Bayonne.]

Bayonne, October 24, 1895.

Sir—I do not approve of the projected Congress.

It seems to me that it is a concession to the doctrinal scepticism which is invading and to the notion now prevailing among the middle classes, that all doctrines are of equal value.

This kind of modified Christianity robs faith of its simplest and most fundamental motive of credence, which is the authority of the Church. It is a step backward toward the natural theology of the pagans.

The people will conclude that they have been led into error until now, not only concerning the rights of the Gospel, which must be believed in its whole content, but also concerning its efficacy, which belongs especially to the Catholic doctrine, which is the truth, to procure the welfare of society and of the individual.

I could call attention to certain expressions in your article, for instance, "the old confessional separations." Were these separations not established by our Saviour himself?

Nevertheless, I pay my respects to your unquestionable talents, your undoubted zeal, and the noble aspirations of your heart.

I confess that I shall be a little embarrassed to find myself opposed to the high dignitaries and renowned churchmen whom your letter names, and whom I both love and respect. François,

Bishop of Bayonne.

LETTER FROM P. BAUDRILLART.

[Priest of the Oratory and Doctor of Theology at the Catholic Institute at Paris.]

Dear Sir—I indeed admired very much the lecture which Mgr. Keane delivered at Brussels, and which I have published in the *Bulletin Critique*, but if a Congress of Religions was quite legitimate in a country where many religions exist, I cannot be persuaded that it will be useful for us. I even believe, although something might be said against this objection, that the French are not sufficiently religious to support the enterprise without prejudice. Further, if the Catholics of America did well to take part in a Congress proposed by others, and which would have taken place without them, it seems to me that Catholics should not take the initiative in assemblages of this kind.

(Signed) Alfred Baudrillart.

LETTER FROM PROF. C. DE HARLEZ.

[Professor at the University of Louvain.]

Louvain, November 1, 1895.

Honored Sir—You ask me for advice concerning the holding of a Second Religious Parliament in Paris, and in response to the confidence with which you honor me, I shall speak my mind with perfect frankness and simplicity.

If this Second Congress be exactly like the first, if the representatives of the Catholic religion can play in that grand European city the same rôle as in Chicago, it seems to me not doubtful that the results of the Second Congress will be good and even better than those of the first.

It is, therefore, necessary above all to take such measures that in our unfortunate Europe and under the influences to which France, and especially Paris, are exposed to-day, the Freethinkers shall not take the leadership of a gathering of religious people.

If, therefore, one could be assured of an amiable and orderly procedure at the meetings of the Parliament of Religions, and also that Catholicism would receive the place due to it, I could only join with my feeble voice those distinguished men who demand a new meeting of the Congress and a repetition of the touching scenes of which the American city was a happy witness.

Facts have proved that the Catholic religion has nothing to fear from these brotherly meetings, among which it does not make its appearance as a merely human religion like all the rest, but where it is revealed to many noble and sincere minds who do not know it, or have a wrong idea of it.

How powerful, how efficient is a simple exposition of our dogmas stated in the language of brotherly love! Who does not know the advice of the sweet Apostle of Chablais, of the great ecclesiastical Doctor, François de Sales?

"In order to convince and to convert dissenters, do not argue, but avoid all polemics. Polemics irritate and ruffle. Set forth your belief with simplicity and precision. If it be properly understood it will have a greater effect than all the artifices of dialectics."

Nothing is truer than this. Truth is beautiful in itself. Truth has charms which attract the heart. But she is often disguised and unknown. Tear down the veils, let her appear as she is! That is the first condition of a successful propaganda.

But where could one do it with more success than in a gathering which will unite all distinguished men and the priests of all religions under the sun? What a unique opportunity for sowing the seeds of the Gospel in non-Christian countries! What a grand opportunity to dispel prejudices which estrange from us both the worshippers of Oriental religions and the Christians outside the fold of the Roman Church! These prejudices, one does not know how, sometimes lead to contempt and even to hatred. Should we not joyfully seize the opportunity that offers itself to change them into sentiments of brotherly love?

And to a Christian who finds himself in a gathering of this kind, what a lesson will be the sight of a number of men entangled in errors, sometimes of the gravest kind! What a shout of gratitude rises in his heart towards the God of goodness who has protected him against this darkness and illumined him with light! What a burning desire is kindled in his bosom to communicate to his brothers in God this incomparable privilege which makes him the direct heir of the kingdom of heaven!

The mere sight of a Parliament of Religions ought to kindle the sentiments of thankfulness and love of God, of piety, of charity, of zeal for extending salvation to his unfortunate brethren, in the heart of a Christian. And is this not already a great achievement?

The Catholics who were witnesses of the memorable scenes at Chicago attest unanimously that there a wonderful movement originated towards a unity of faith, toward monotheism, and even toward the Gospel. At the same time, their hearts were pervaded by love and compassion for all honest souls deprived of the light of the true faith. But that this movement should persist and develop, it is, of course, necessary that the impulse should be renewed. Otherwise it would weaken and die out.

One can only wish to see a Second Parliament of Religions develop the happy results of the first. It will help to hasten the moment when there will be only one flock and one shepherd, when all men will worship, not only with one voice as in Chicago, but with one and the same sentiment the heavenly Father, whose kingdom will spread over the whole earth, and whose will shall be done.

Could we but see dimly the dawn of this happy day!

C. DE HARLEZ.

LETTER FROM THE VISCOUNT DE MEAUX.

[Leader of the Catholic party in Belgium and author of "L'église catholique et la liberté aux Etats-Unis."]

Sir—I beg you to excuse the delay of my reply to the important and delicate question with which you have honored me.

The Religious Congress of Chicago, that extraordinary and unprecedented event, was a most happy occurrence. Christians, especially Catholics, ought to rejoice in it. We should not doubt it after the formal testimony of Cardinal Gibbons and Mgr. Keane. There was reason to fear such a union, and several Catholic bishops actually did fear it; but since it took place it would have been unfortunate if our church after the fashion of Mohammedanism and of Anglicanism had declined the invitation extended to her. It was good for her to be represented.

There the remnants of primitive religion, fragments of truth, dispersed among the non-Christian religions, viz., in the Asiatic cults, received the light. Their tendency to approach Christianity in the measure that they comprehended it, is manifest, and the Christian faith, particularly the Catholic faith, shone forth in a pure and brilliant light. Thus I could congratulate myself on having been one of the first in France in the *Correspondent* of January 25, 1894, to attract the attention of religious men to this event.

It remains to be seen whether it will be advisable to convene in France during the next Exposition a like Congress, whether the Catholics should inaugurate it, and in case they should not take the initiative, whether they should participate in it.

Two conditions determined the success of the Congress at Chicago, preserving both peace and liberty:

1. Controversy was excluded. The representatives of the various religions expounded successively their creeds and deeds, without attacking the creeds and deeds of others.

2. It was held in a religious atmosphere. The men that in America are called agnostics, and infidels, the same who in Europe are called Freethinkers, occupy little place in the society of the United States, they held still less in the assembly at Chicago, notwithstanding they were not excluded. In spite of the diversities of race and language, of doctrines and morals, the members of this cosmopolitan parliament

discovered among them certain principles and sentiments in common.

Will these two conditions be reproduced at Paris? It is difficult to expect it.

It will doubtless be hard for the French mind, naturally militant, to expound without discussion, to affirm a doctrine without combating the opposite doctrine. Even the suppleness of our language lends itself to thrust, to hostile allusions which provoke retaliation. In short, this momentous religious affair could easily degenerate into polemical discussions, and in a rapid space of time these would cease to be orderly, serious, and complete.

But above all, in the face of the various religions of humanity, what place would irreligion hold? If we close the door upon it European thought will not be presented in its entirety, and if we admit it what will it seek among the various cults, if not division? To what will it apply itself, armed with ironical disdain, if not to sow discord and thus help negation to prevail?

These, in my opinion, are the dangers of a project the grandeur and importance of which I otherwise do not underrate. I do not state these dangers without regret, for they prove the defects of our time and our country. They may not be insurmountable but they are formidable, and if the leaders of our Church in France do not consent to brave them I will neither blame them nor would it surprise me.

Could a Congress of Religions be held at Paris without being convened and supported by them? In such a case the duly authorised Catholics who would preside there would have to consider which would be heavier, the responsibility assumed by taking part, or by refusing to do so.

In a word, it devolves on the men who can judge of the religious condition of France, and the needs of souls there, not upon me, to answer such questions. All we can do is to agitate them, but not to decide them.

VICOMTE DE MEAUX.

LETTER OF M. BONET-MAURY.

[Delegate of the French Protestants to the Parliament of Religions at Chicago.]

Monsieur l'Abbé—You ask me to express by letter my opinion upon the question of a Universal Congress of Religions at Paris in 1900—a question which you presented in strong terms in the *Revue de Paris* of September 1.

My adhesion to the principle of such a Congress could not be doubtful, for I myself have become convinced of the happy result of the Parliament at Chicago, for the awakening of religious life, the establishment of interconfessional peace, and the influence of missionaries on pagan nations. From all these points of view a like enterprise can only contribute to the advancement of the reign of truth, of justice, and fraternity upon earth. This is why I join you with all my heart.

However, I do not overlook the difficulties which the project involves. First, proud though I am to think that the capital of France should have been the place chosen for so noble a rendezvous, yet Paris seems to me to offer a less favorable soil for such a gathering than Chicago or any other American city, or a federal country like Switzerland.

In the United States the clergy are in closer contact with the people and associate more willingly with the movements of public opinion. In France the ecclesiastics are subject to a powerful hierarchy, and form a body much more closed to external influences. Moreover, in America, on account of the multiplicity of races and religions, there has for a long time existed a powerful spirit of tolerance, and the habit of cooperating in works of charity. In our country often disrupted, alas! by religious wars, or distracted by political revolutions, we are, on the contrary surrounded by a crowd of prejudiced and rancorous persons, to say nothing of the confessional hatred that opposes all approach. These obstacles, however, are not invincible. The existence in Paris itself of the League Against Atheism and of the Union for Moral Action, which counts in its ranks Catholics, Protestants, and Israelites, is a good augury for the success of a Congress of Religions.

The greatest difficulty, it appears to me, is on the side of the Catholic Church, which preponderates in France. Accustomed to treat dissenters as a factor that can be ignored, she would see a derogation of her privileges in any participation in a Congress of Religions.

There is a misunderstanding that first of all must be dissipated. The Congress at Paris, like that at Chicago, should not be a parliament or council where the different religions would give themselves up to controversy and discussion to decide which is the best among them. Each ought, according to its doctrine, to expound the solution which it is able to furnish of the moral and social problems which occupy humanity, and that without suppressing and also without criticising other solutions.

Further, the Congress will not be, as some appear to fear, "a crucible where all the religions will melt into an impossible unity, which will result in a universal religion." No, its rôle will be more modest. It will strive only, as did the organisers of the Congress at Chicago, to form the holy league of all religions against irreligion and against immorality; all cults to proclaim these two articles of evangelical faith: "I

believe in one God," and "All men are brothers," and then to adopt "Our Father" for the universal prayer.

The Pope, Leo XIII., with his breadth of mind and his almost prophetic foresight, has understood the high value of a new Congress and the impulse that it would give Christianity toward unity. He has pronounced a favorable opinion on the project. But he has reserved liberty of action for the Church of France. All depends, then, on the decision of her leaders. Perhaps they will comprehend what a powerful stimulant to faith and piety such a Congress may be—and then they will come to this Congress of all the religions, in which they are sure to obtain all the honors due to them, and where they can keep intact the liberty of their convictions. Or they will refuse to participate in such an assembly, and then they will carry the heavy responsibility of rendering the Congress impossible. To let escape the most beautiful occasion which will ever be presented to them to make glorious in the eyes of the pagan, the uninformed, and the incredulous freethinker, this Gospel and this cross of Christ to which has been promised the victory over the world!

G. Bonet-Maury.

LETTER OF CHARLES C. BONNEY.

[President of the World's Congresses held at Chicago in 1893.]

Dear Sir—Allow me to thank you for your admirable article which appeared in the *Revue de Paris*, upon "A Universal Congress of Religions in 1900." That project has given the greatest pleasure to us in America who remain faithful to the idea of a universal Parliament of Religions. We could but be highly gratified by the ability and eloquence with which you expound the project of repeating at Paris, at the time of the International Exposition which will open the twentieth century, the august and soul-stirring manifestation of Chicago in 1893. I am therefore ready to give you my best aid and counsel for the organisation of the vast enterprise of which you and your friends have assumed the difficult task. I have great hopes that you may obtain the support of the government of your country, as well as of the great religious minds, and that your project, in spite of all obstacles, will achieve a triumphant success.

Charles C. Bonney.

LETTER OF M. NEGRI.

[Editor of the *Perseveranza* of Milan.]

Milan, October 17, 1895.

Sir—I thank you sincerely for your polite letter, and I am happy that you approve of my manner of interpreting the grand idea proposed by you. I wish you with all my heart success in the accomplishment of your project, but I do not know enough of the dispositions and forces of the religious people in France to foresee the result. In Italy, a movement such as yours would be received with indifference.

In Italy the religious sentiment, after the great crisis of the Middle Ages, has been stifled by irony and scepticism. The papacy of the Renaissance so amused Italy that it has killed all seriousness in religion. This is the reason why the discipline of Jesuitical orthodoxy is with us all-powerful. Public opinion follows it blindly from habit, and does not believe it worth the trouble to resist. Not finding in it the power to do so when religious questions are agitated, it reserves by a strange but human contradiction the liberty of complacently excommunicating itself in political questions.

But in France the condition of the religious mind ought to be very different and favorable to such an idea as yours. You will certainly have met with antagonism, but you work for the future. There is only one way to keep alive the religious sentiment in modern society, and that is to return to the pure source of the Gospel, passing by the rocky and barren mountains of dogmatic systems. The Gospel is eternally young. Can we say the same of all the parasitic plants which have overgrown it? And there is in the Gospel a principle of peace and unity in which future humanity may retrieve peace of mind.

I intend to follow with deep interest your efforts and work, and shall be happy to announce to my countrymen from day to day that you are approaching the realisation of the noble idea which you have given to the world.

Gaston Negri.

LETTER OF M. ERNEST NAVILLE.

[The well-known scholar and author of *Le Témoignage du Christ et l'unité du monde chrétien.*]

Geneva, September 21, 1895.

Sir—I have just read your article in the *Revue de Paris*.

I hardly need tell you that I read it with great interest and emotion. One must have a very superficial mind not to accord serious attention to the Parliament of Religions at Chicago. I will present to the readers of the *Journal de Genève* your great project of a Congress of Religions at Paris, but it necessarily will take me some time to arrive at a clear opinion upon so grave a matter.

My ideas upon the unity of the Christian world are known to you, since you read my book, *The Testimony of Christ*, with a sympathy, the expression of which I appreciate. The unity of the Christian world raises other questions and claims, other investigations which I shall undertake in the near future with as much energy as is left to a man who will complete his eightieth year in 1896.

Ernest Naville.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

BY ATHERTON BLIGHT.

"Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichniss."

AMIEL said with profound significance, "Entanglement is the condition of life, order and clearness are the signs of serious and successful thought."

Robertson of Brighton, a very tower of liberal thought in his day, declared that most arguments are verbal arguments. Therefore it becomes the writers of *The Open Court* to define—to define as clearly as possible all their positions.

Coleridge warned us more than two generations ago that "when you do not understand an author, consider yourself ignorant of his understanding." It is in this spirit that I approach some of Dr. Carus's recent utterances in his most interesting weekly journal, Are not Corvinus and Mr. Thurtell right in their accusations of ambiguity? In *The Open Court*, December 12, 1895, Dr. Carus says: "The cardinal point on which the difference between the old and the new view comes out lies not in the fall of man, but in the resurrection of Christ . . . the soul of Jesus has become, and is even to-day, a living presence in the aspirations of mankind, . . . the moral aspirations of Jesus must be impressed into the minds of men. He must be resurrected in every heart so as to become the dominant power of all impulses, the directive control in life, the ultimate motive of all actions."

Now if we turn to Lord Acton's introductory lecture at Cambridge upon succeeding Sir John Seeley in the chair of Modern History, we find that learned man and excellent Catholic, albeit of the Döllinger type, declaring that "the influence of Christ who is risen upon mankind whom he redeemed has increased and is increasing." Would our editor and the Cambridge Professor agree with regard to the character of the influence of Christ upon the world? Lord Acton consistently accepts the so-called supernatural standpoint of the churches. Jesus as Son of God, "very God of very God," having in very truth, as an historical fact, risen from the dead, influences and will forever influence *mankind*. But Dr. Carus has utterly overthrown the supernatural of the churches, and looks upon Jesus as a remarkably endowed Hebrew of humble parentage. Renan, in his charming *Souvenirs de l'enfance et Jeunesse*, says (I quote from memory): "I felt strongly at that time (1848–1849) that the Christ would come from Germany, not the person, the individual supernatural being, but the new spirit, the new era, the new burst of spiritual life would come from the other side of the Rhine." Is there not then just a little ambiguity in the way Dr. Carus holds on to the individual Christ? Has he not as a person become a little shadowy to many of us? Has he not become the symbol for the "great whatsoevers" of St. Paul? Emerson said profoundly, "there are no such men as we fable," and again, "so many saints and saviours, so many high behaviors" accompany us through life. The late Professor Darmesteter's last hope and dream was that mankind would return to the glorious trumpet notes of the great Hebrew prophets, the burden of whose teaching is: "Let righteousness gush forth as water and justice as a never-failing stream." In conclusion allow me to quote somewhat at length from a notice of Matthew Arnold's letters in the *New York Evening Post*, which may have escaped the notice of your readers:

"We quote these passages because they show Arnold clinging with his whole soul to the Church and his Bible, and at the same time ready to throw overboard the doctrines and mysteries of theology, the mechanism of ritual, the miracles and thaumaturgy of Christianity; even ready to forego the positive belief in a personal immortality. . . . The Church remains to him an ethical society,—a society for the propagation of virtue, the pursuit of righteousness,—but a society rooted in immemorial associations, and drawing its nourishment largely from a single book and a single exemplar of perfect life."

* * *

IN REPLY.

[Mr. Blight seems to consider the sentence quoted as a statement that refers exclusively to Jesus. The meaning of the passage, I hope, will be clear as soon as our readers bear in mind that immortality is a common attribute of all souls. What we said of the resurrection of Jesus holds good of every other man whose aspirations continue to sway mankind.

By immortality we do not mean the resuscitation to life of the body of Jesus. That conception of Christ's resurrection has been surrendered even by pious and faithful theologians. A resurrection of the body has no moral significance, but the implanting of the ideal aspirations of a great leader into the hearts of men is of paramount importance.

There can be no doubt that Jesus of Nazareth, whoever he may have been, even if he had existed only in the imagination of his followers as a kind of artificial or ideal personality, has created a new atmosphere in the Western world from the influence of which no one can withdraw himself; and so did Buddha among the Eastern nations. Both Buddha and Christ pronounced certain ideals which impressed their disciples, who went out to preach them to others. Thus the movement spread over continents, and in every one who receives the message and is affected by its noble sentiment, the soul of the master who proclaimed it is resurrected. Christ lives in the Christians; Buddha lives in the Buddhists; Mohammed lives in the Moslems.

This is an immortality which is not diffuse, not a pantheistic dissolution into the All-life. It is the preservation of definite thoughts and distinct soul-forms; it is a transference of the most essential features of a man, which are impressed into the minds of others in the form of word-combinations embodying the characteristic traits of his great personality.

In this sense we say that Jesus is a living presence in mankind. For what is Jesus if not the sentiments which he taught? The spirit of Jesus lives in his words. The same is true of Buddha, and in this sense we may claim immortality for all men according to their deeds and thoughts, of Kant, of Goethe, of Washington, of Lincoln, and on a smaller scale, of every blessed soul that plodded through life, attending faithfully to the duties thereof.

Every moral being leaves a little heritage of blessings which is an indestructible treasure that no moth can eat and no thief can steal. A poor day-laborer's wife who in her motherly love patiently attends to the drudgery of innumerable annoying household trifles and struggles against odds, lives on not only in her children and children's children, but in all who are affected by her example.

Nothing that is good is lost; evil alone leads to destruction, for absolute evil is so bad that it cannot exist. Absolute evil involves impossibility of existence. Immoral conduct, if persisted in, will within three or four generations abolish itself; but the bliss of truth, sincerity, and noble deeds lasts forever.—ED.]

PROFESSOR BOYESEN AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

BACK in the seventies, when I was an undergraduate at Cornell University, Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen suddenly made his appearance at Ithaca as one of the professors in the German department. I was a member of his classes and soon became quite well acquainted with him outside of the recitation-room. The malady so prevalent among collegians—*cacoethes scribendi*—seized me at about this time, and during the Sundays of a month in my sophomore year I amused myself by preparing a little sketch of Boyesen at Cornell.

One evening last autumn, a few days after Boyesen's untimely death, I met at the New York Authors' Club, Mr. Howells, who, it will be remembered, was the "discoverer" of the Norse-American novelist. He asked me many questions about Boyesen's six years' sojourn at Cornell, which is, it appears, one of the less-known periods in his short career. It occurred to me, therefore, when, the other day I chanced upon the manuscript of my college sketch, hidden away with other papers in an old box, that it might be interesting to give it a corner in your columns; for many of your readers must have known Boyesen through his numerous books and magazine articles. Here it is, almost exactly as it was written some twenty years ago:

"H. H." once expressed surprise that the author of "Gunnar" could find the atmosphere of Cornell University congenial. But like many others, who, form their opinion concerning this institution without visiting it, the gifted poetess does not know that there is that about the young, free University on Cayuga Lake which exactly chimes in with the fresh liberal soul of Boyesen. The grand scenery about Ithaca, the many-sided sermons at Sage Chapel, the equality of scientific and literary studies, the union in one faculty of men of letters and men of science, the mingling in the college world of a body of intelligent and cultivated women, a close association of students and professors, and everywhere a general spirit of freedom and independence,—all this produces an atmosphere not to be found perhaps in any other university centre in America, an atmosphere just suited to the intellectual lungs of the Norse novelist.

Boyesen the professor does not differ materially from Boyesen the author. An æsthetic nature, enthusiasm, refined humor and great breadth of mind crop out in his lectures as well as in his romances. To these important parts, so seldom found united in the teacher, is added that substratum of all successful instruction, scholarship. Besides a knowledge of the German language and literature and an imbibition of the Germanic spirit, due in part to membership in the great Teutonic family and in part to a residence at Leipsic University, Professor Boyesen is acquainted with other languages both ancient and modern, all of which are brought to bear on his interpretation of the German. It is this Germanic spirit and a mastery of English which enables him to transmit to his students instruction, artistically interwoven into the dry warp of the recitation, and gives a charm to Professor Boyesen's teaching which can be appreciated only by those who have listened to him.

Prof. Boyesen belongs pre-eminently to that very small class of teachers of languages who know how to make grammar secondary to the poetry of speech, so that when a pupil leaves him, he can give not only the principal parts of the irregular verbs, but he has become impregnated with what is much more valuable, a lasting love for German literature. The monotonous, sleepy, antiquated modes of teaching so universal in our colleges years ago and unfortunately still lingering here and there, find no counterpart in the varied, wide-awake, fresh method adapted by Professor Boyesen. He is all life and his enthusiasm is contagious. There is nothing narcotic in his lecture-room and his stu-

dents are never drowsy. If he pronounces the German before translating it, the laws of elocution are observed, and the true spirit of the passage given. When a word in the text suggests an idea, Professor Boyesen will suddenly rise from his chair, step from behind the desk and walking the floor or standing on the raised platform, will pour forth his thoughts, his speech at such moments often bordering on true eloquence, and his language always displaying force and grace.

In Schiller's "Wilhelm Tell," he will support with great ardor the superiority of the farewell scene between Tell and his wife, to that which follows between Rudens and Bertha. When he would define a lyric, in contradistinction to an epic poet, he employs this beautiful simile: "The lyric poet sings the emotions springing from his own breast; but the epic poet is like the broad river which reflects in its bosom the lofty mountains, branching oaks and tiny flowers that it winds among."

Professor Boyesen has a very refined poetic taste, a most æsthetic mind's eye. "Faust" interpreted by him is a rare treat. Grammatical questions give way to a consideration of the graces of the languages, the rhythm of the verse and the deep hidden meaning of the poet, while snatches from Goethe's life are dexterously thrown in here and there until the author himself becomes identified with his work.

Professor Boyesen possesses a large fund of humor and *esprit*. He never spoils his *bons mots* and anecdotes with too much filling, but leaves the imagination something to do. He hints at his points. Meeting one day a passage in "Faust" about the rendering of which the critics differ, he remarked, "'Faust,' like the Koran and some other good books, admits of various interpretations." Referring on another occasion, during the reading of the "Prologue in Heaven," to the suggestions which Goethe had received from the Book of Job, he observed: "It always seemed odd to me that the Hebraic idea of compensation for long suffering was a wife and seven children." After a spirited analysis of the character of Mephistopheles, Boyesen added: "He is a gentleman who would be well received in New York society, and in Boston he would be lionised."

Professor Boyesen's liberalism also displays itself in the lecture-room, but never in a way to offend the most conservative of his hearers. Though a zealous republican in politics, he is not a Jingo; though a reformer, he is not a fanatic; though an independent thinker in religion, he is not an atheist; and in literature and art, while a worshipper of the beautiful, he is not a defender of artistic immorality. Broad-minded but not extreme in any of his views, his lecture-room is pervaded by an air that strengthens, enlarges, and elevates the mental and moral nature.

The artistic faculty, by which I mean not only an innate love of the beautiful, but also a technical acquaintance with the fine arts, is possessed by Professor Boyesen in a large degree. This is due chiefly to his early association with artists, while a student at the University of Christiania, and to his study, at a later date of the great masterpieces in the picture-galleries of the European capitals. The grand scenery of his native Norway may have given in youth an artistic bent to his mind. But his critical knowledge of art was acquired as he sat beside the easels of his friends in the University town, or while roaming through the Louvre in company with Tourguéneff. Art had such a strong hold upon him at this time that he seriously thought for a moment of becoming an art critic. He has in his possession several oil-paintings which were given him as souvenirs of friendship, on parting with his Christiania companions, before sailing for America. Some of these pictures are of considerable merit, and one or two of the artists who painted them have now won a European reputation. But they are valued by their possessor quite as much on account of the pleasant memories associated with them as for their artistic worth.

In the South Building of Cornell University, high upon East Hill, is a small room commanding a fine view of Cayuga Lake to the north and the long valley to the south, in the north end of which Ithaca lies nestled. An oaken desk and chair, a dozen comfortable benches, five pictures in black walnut frames on the neatly papered walls,—such are the main features of Boyesen's lecture-room. Three of the pictures are photographs of portraits of Goethe, Schiller, and Lessing, another a scene from "Faust," and the fifth a small likeness of Tourguéneff, bearing his sign-manual, a gift from the Russian novelist to his Norwegian friend.

In "Cascadilla," the University dormitory building, Professor Boyesen has his private apartments. From his sitting-room a view can be had of the valley but not of the lake. On the walls are hung several Norwegian landscapes in oil, and two or three good engravings, studies from characters in German literature. Two busts of Goethe and Schiller, the former from the Trippel cast and the latter from the Danecker, stand on the two bookcases, where is a good collection of American poetry, including several volumes of obscure poets. There is a set of Tourguéneff's writings, partly in French and partly in German, some of the volumes containing the author's autograph. I believe this is the only complete collection of Tourguéneff's works in this country. A set of Heine, Boyesen's favorite poet, is also found on one of the shelves. Many of the books are presentation copies from well-known authors of Europe and Amer-

ica. One shelf is filled with standard works on the literature of all countries, in various languages, forming, as it were, a universal history of modern literature.

BOOK NOTICES.

Macmillan & Co. are publishing *The Modern Reader's Bible* and we have before us one volume of the series, "The Proverbs," edited with introduction and notes, by Prof. Richard G. Moulton of the University of Chicago. As to the plan of the whole series Professor Moulton says in his introduction: "*The Modern Reader's Bible* does not touch matters of devotion or theology. Its purpose is to put forward Biblical works as portions of World Literature, with an interest of their own for every variety of reader. But if they are to be so appreciated, it is necessary that they should be stripped of the mediæval and anti-literary form in which our current Bibles allow them to be obscured." In agreement with this maxim Professor Moulton has revised that book of the Old Testament which commonly goes by the name of the "Proverbs of Solomon."

The reader will be greatly benefited by the explanation of the various poetical forms which are employed in this book and also by a few instructive hints concerning the philosophical evolution that took place in the wisdom literature of ancient Israel. Professor Moulton says:

"The earlier works, Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, give us only Isolated Observations of life; these are reflected in brief proverbs, or in literary forms but little removed from proverbs, and each is entirely distinct and complete in itself. The further notion of the connectedness of all things is not ignored in these earlier books, but is looked upon as no subject for reflective analysis; the wise men approach the universe as a whole with feelings only of adoration, and the philosopher becomes a poet singing of this whole as 'Wisdom.' Ecclesiastes marks the point where, for the first time, reflective analysis has been turned upon the sum things: the sudden responsibility becomes too great, and philosophy breaks down in despair. The word 'wisdom' now becomes confined for the most part to lesser achievements, or to the observing faculty; the universal is no longer a unity that can be adored, but a broken 'All things,' the attempt to understand which is 'vanity.' There is an advance from this position in the latest of the books of wisdom, the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon. Here philosophy recovers its tone of rapture; the recovery is made, not by returning to the restricted area of observation, but by still further enlarging it. The Preacher had considered only this life; his successor recognises a life beyond the grave, and in immortality finds a solution of present mysteries. Whereas the Preacher had confined himself to the present, the new wisdom adds the past of history, and presents Wisdom as Providence. And a single passage—where however the topic is only raised, and not followed into detail—shows that this close of Wisdom literature extends its observation even from human life to external nature. Thus these four—Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, and Wisdom of Solomon—make a distinct progression of thought. And somewhere in this line of thought—it is needless to discuss exactly where—comes the remaining work of Wisdom literature, the Book of Job. Here again it is the universe as a whole which is under consideration, or at least, its leading problem, the Mystery of Evil."

The book is handy and the whole plan marks a great progress in the popularisation of Bible literature. The text is that of the revised version.

Readers interested in the pathology of mind will find a very able and instructive article in the July *Alienist and Neurologist* (1895) by Dr. James G. Kiernan, discussing the question whether Carlyle was insane or not. Dr. Kiernan, as an alienist and student of literature, decides the question in the negative.

CONTENTS OF NO. 442.

EUROPEAN OPINIONS ON THE SECOND PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS 4807
THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS. Atherton Blight. 4811
PROFESSOR BOYESEN AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY. Theodore Stanton 4812
BOOK NOTICES 4814